



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

morality from history, by applying this theory, as Margerie does, is going too far. Few books breathe such a high moral sentiment and a more noble indignation against evil, p. 290.

According to Barzellotti all of Taine's comparative studies on the past of literature, art, and the social life of Europe can be looked upon as an introduction or preparatory study to his *Origines Contemporaines*, and this is a psychology of the mind and soul of his country, an anxious clinical diagnosis of his beloved patient, La France, p. 344. The work must be judged from the large aspect of art, as the last result of a literary elaboration to which a writer arrives in giving us his conception according to the plan he has traced and the aim he has proposed. Judged from this point of view, it impresses our author as a work which presupposes another or others to which it replies; it is the reply of an accuser to a defense already presented, of the partisan of the Revolution and Empire, p. 346. This attitude is entirely new. Barzellotti's conclusion is: As for the entire work, the grandeur of the enterprise seems to have surpassed the measure, if not of his talent, at least of his forces and his physical vigor; but the monumental and what is new will endure and those who cover this field by a different road will never lose sight of the profound traces which Taine has left, p. 350. This view is of great interest, coming from such a profound and trustworthy authority. From him the spirit of Taine's work is one of the vastest inquiries into facts and moral data on man and life ever undertaken in aid of historical investigation; no one before him has known better how to study souls, crowds, peoples, races, instead of soul, individual, race, p. 405.

In giving a general estimate of this work, it may be called the most comprehensive, profound, appreciative and satisfactory study on Taine that has appeared up to 1900. in some respects up to the present day.

The essay of Salomon in *Études et Portr. Litt.*, 1896, first appeared in the *Gaz. de France*, 1894; it hardly deserves a place among the more important works on Taine.

Wyzewa, *Nos Maitres*, 1895, makes the statement that Taine is hardly a scholar or philosopher, but a method, a prodigious *ensemble* of

formulas and operations, the most complicated, harmonious, perfect literary machine. This article, and those of Rod, Tissot, Colani, Lemaître, Renard and Biré, are all rather short, and more or less interesting reading, but they have added nothing new to the study of Taine.

HUGO P. THIEME.

*University of Michigan.*

### THE SOURCES OF ROMEO AND JULIET.

A comparison of Arthur Brooke's version of the story of Romeo and Juliet with that of Paynter shows that they are absolutely identical in plot. There is not an incident in one that is not in the other, nor in the order of incidents is there to be found any variation. One of two things must be true—and the first is mentioned only as a bare possibility, and to be at once dismissed as altogether unlikely: either Paynter made a metaphrase of Brooke's poem, or both followed pretty slavishly the same original. Boisteau's translation—or rather paraphrase—of Bandello's novel is not easily accessible. But if one postulates that paraphrase as the original of Brooke and Paynter, one may be absolutely certain what its plot is. There is no conflict in the testimony of two witnesses about it.

Boisteau took large liberties with his Italian original. Besides the important difference of not having Juliet wake before Romeo dies, there are several minor differences, one of which will serve by way of illustration. In Boisteau Romeo buys his poison of an apothecary whom he tempts by a handful of gold to break the law, for selling poison was a capital crime. Romeo is careful to put the name of this apothecary in the post-mortem letter he writes his father, and the poor fellow is promptly apprehended and tortured to death. It is difficult to see why Boisteau went out of his way to make the hero of his story do so unspeakably mean a thing as to tempt a man to wrong-doing by taking advantage of his poverty, and then report him to the authorities. The Bandello Romeo takes a vial of deadly poison and goes to Verona, but nothing is said about where he got it.

The Bandello story is so different from that

of Boisteau as to suggest that it was probably not an Italian stage on which Brooke "saw the same argument lately set forth;" for it may be fairly supposed that an Italian play-wright would have stuck pretty closely to his *Bandello*. This, of course, has some bearing on the question as to whether there was an old English play on *Romeo and Juliet* which Shakespeare may have had before him.

One feels pretty certain that Shakespeare never saw the *Bandello* story, though in two or three not very important particulars *Bandello* is nearer Shakespeare than Brooke and Paynter are. For example, there is a rather more suggestive outline of the character of *Mercutio* in *Bandello* than is to be found in either of the English versions of the story. Then, too, the movement of the story is rapid and does not give one the impression of covering much time. But these particulars have not much significance. One cannot help feeling that if Shakespeare had read *Bandello* it is more than likely he would not have allowed *Romeo* to die without a farewell from *Juliet*, and would have had them breathe out their lives together.

If ever Shakespeare saw the Paynter version he must have made merry over it. Without being at all familiar with the original, one does not hesitate to say that Paynter's translation is one of the wretchedest attempts at that sort of thing to be found anywhere in the world. It is as frigid as an Eskimo classic. A stupid schoolboy could not be more stiff and awkward and bungling. Here is *Romeo's* greeting just after the death of *Tybalt*:

"Mine owne dearest friende Julietta, I am not now determined to recite the particulars of the strange happes of frayle and inconstant Fortune, who in a momente hoystethe a man up to the hyghest degree of hir wheel, and by and by in lesse space than in the twynckling of an eye she throweth hym downe agayne so lowe, as more miserie is prepared for him in one day, than favour in one hundred years."

Brooke's version of *Romeo's* speech shows passionate feeling and some attempt at natural utterance that shall have both strength and grace. The Boisteau figure of the wheel is piously retained but mercifully modified. *Bandello* manages the entire scene much better than his adapter did. As to the question of Shakespeare's use of Paynter as a source,

what has already been said furnishes plain indications of the nature of the answer, though judgment may well be held in abeyance for the moment. A little later in the discussion a more emphatic answer may be made.

As was said at the outset, a comparison of Paynter and Brooke shows identity of plot; but such a comparison shows, too, several interesting differences and one of very great importance. In a way these differences are all of the same sort: they concern themselves with characterization. Brooke does a good deal towards making the personages of the story real and their conduct plausible. In two cases, at least, under Brooke's hands *Romeo* is greatly improved. Paynter devotes two pages to describing the perturbation and grief in which *Juliet* wore away the night after meeting and falling in love with *Romeo* and then finding out that he was a Montague. Barely two lines are devoted to describing *Romeo's* feelings under circumstances that are exactly parallel. *Romeo* shows a philosophic coolness that does him no credit, and is entirely out of keeping with his temperament. Brooke comes to the rescue and gives nearly a page to showing that the night was a sleepless one for *Romeo* too, and prepares us for his appearance bright and early next morning under *Juliet's* window.

Again, Paynter dilates at length on the misery of *Juliet* after *Romeo's* banishment, but says that *Romeo*, with books and boon companions, passed the time very pleasantly. Take men and women by and large and Paynter's contrast is pretty near the truth, but it will not do for the *Romeo* and *Juliet* of this story. So Brooke has left out the books and boon companions altogether, and shows us *Romeo* every bit as unhappy in Mantua as *Juliet* is in Verona.

But let us consider the most important addition Brooke made to the Boisteau story. It is the Nurse. In Brooke's poem the Nurse is a really fine piece of characterization. She is not Shakespeare's creation at all. She does not show a single trait of character in the play that she does not show in the poem. Her garrulosity—so tantalizing to the lovers—her free and familiar speech, her graphic

homely phrase, her sordid ethics and quick transference of allegiance from the banished lover to the one at home—all this is admirably brought out in Brooke, and more besides. Shakespeare, with Peter and Mercutio as accessories, has not given us a better Nurse than Brooke's. So far from the Nurse being notably Shakespeare's creation, it would be difficult to point out another person in all the Shakespeare multitude that came so nearly ready-made to his hand.

If it were not for the possible existence of an Old English play having for its subject the story of Romeo and Juliet, one could say unhesitatingly that Shakespeare used Brooke as his chief source. There could be no doubt that he wrote his play with Brooke before him. Perhaps this is the place for the promised emphatic answer to the question as to Shakespeare's indebtedness to Paynter. Why would he need Paynter's paraphrase before him? There is everything in Brooke that there is in Paynter and a good many things besides. Can one imagine Shakespeare tolerating the unnecessary presence of Paynter's story? That Shakespeare owed nothing to Paynter is a practical certainty.

But to return to this Old English play. There may have been such a play, which furnished Brooke with his characterization of the Nurse. In that case, Shakespeare may have had access to it also, and so owe nothing to Brooke. The fact that Brooke shows considerable skill in characterization all through the poem, and especially in situations with which it is not at all likely any play ever dealt, as in the Romeo examples already cited,—leads one to think that the characterization of the Nurse, as good as it is, was not beyond Brooke's powers, and that it is not necessary to postulate the existence of an old play to account for anything in Brooke's poem.

In passing from *The Sources of Romeo and Juliet* to the play itself, it may be worth while to notice the variations in Juliet's age as she appears in the four stories. In *Bandello* she is eighteen, in *Brooke* sixteen, in *Paynter* eighteen, in *Shakespeare* fourteen. In *Boisteau* she is eighteen, one argues. Brooke could feel that eighteen was too aged to suit the Elizabethan public, and so made his

heroine a couple of years younger. Shakespeare, understanding his public better, put her at fourteen. Paynter, utterly impervious to publics, follows his *Boisteau*.

Attention has already been called to the fact that *Boisteau's* most notable change in the *Bandello* story is in the scene in the tomb of the *Capulets*. Curiously enough Shakespeare's most important variation from *Boisteau's* version is in the treatment of this very scene. It is hard to see what artistic end the introduction of *Paris* subserves. His presence there is an intrusion. His death at *Romeo's* hands is not at all a dramatic necessity. Shakespeare has quite robbed the scene of all the pathetic dignity and appealing sense of unavailing woe which it has in the Italian original, or even in *Brooke's* poem. Throughout the play we see so little of *Paris*—he appears but three times, and for only a moment each time—and he is so colorless when we do see him, that it is with a start that we are reminded of his existence when he comes into the tomb. *Boisteau* marred *Bandello*, and Shakespeare marred *Boisteau*.

Among other minor variations one or two may be noted. It is not easy to see why the play should end with the *Friar* and *Romeo's* servant still in custody. Evidently the *Prince* in saying that "Some shall be pardon'd and some shall be punished," meant that these two should be pardoned; but who should be punished? the "poor 'pothecary?'" *Romeo* writes in his letter to his father that he bought his poison of a poor apothecary; but after reading *Romeo's* interview with the apothecary one feels nothing but pity for the poor wretch whom *Romeo's* gold and eloquence overcame, and one cannot help feeling sorry that *Romeo* should have spoken even vaguely of a poor apothecary at Mantua. Even that would serve as a clue for the police. Who else shall be punished? the Nurse? But she does not appear in this last act of the play and seems to have dropped quite out of consideration.

All this may seem like making a good deal of stir about a trifle; it is a trifle, but it goes to show Shakespeare's occasional carelessness in the handling of material. Probably when Shakespeare wrote the line "Some shall be

pardon'd and some punished," he had in mind not his own play but Brooke's poem. There the Friar and Romeo's servant were pardoned, the Nurse banished, and the Apothecary put to death. It seems as if in winding up his play Shakespeare clung too closely to the ending of a rather different story. To have wound up the play—as Bandello did his story—with the Prince's pardon of the Friar and the servant, and saying nothing about punishing anybody—for who indeed is there to punish?—would have made a more fitting close.

In managing the death of Tybalt Shakespeare has greatly improved upon his original. In Boisteau's version of the story Romeo comes upon a street fight between partisans of the rival houses, with the help of bystanders tries to part the combatants, is savagely attacked by Tybalt, and partly in sudden anger and partly in self-defence kills him. It is a rough and tumble affair, and the part Romeo plays is rather vulgar and unheroic. In Shakespeare, Romeo, though he has shown himself patient under the insults of Tybalt, when he learns that Tybalt has slain Mercutio, in noble rage dares him to combat, and kills him in really heroic fashion. And, too, Shakespeare has substituted the distinctness so absolutely necessary in dramatic action for the hopeless confusion of the original quarrel.

In comparing Shakespeare with his original the most noticeable difference in plot is that of order. In Boisteau Tybalt does not come into the story until it is time to be killed; Paris, until it is time for Juliet to marry. In Shakespeare these two men and Mercutio—all of whom are so necessary to the progress of the play, and do so much to keep it going—are introduced at once. And they are brought before us often enough to prepare our minds for the parts they are to play. Thus the first time we see Tybalt he is trying to pick a quarrel with the pacific Benvolio. Then at Capulet's party it is Tybalt who is eager to fight Romeo for having presumed to come, but the master of the house insists that there shall be no disturbance. By this time we are properly prepared for Tybalt's doing the thing he is in the play for, namely, getting into a quarrel that shall result in his death at the hands of Romeo.

ARTHUR J. ROBERTS.

Colby College.

#### AN EARLIER WAVERLEY.

SIR WALTER SCOTT, in his introductory chapter to *Waverley*, gives a pleasant account of the motives that led him to choose his title. After discarding "the chivalrous epithets of Howard, Mordaunt, or Stanley" and "the softer and more sentimental sounds of Belmour, Belville, Belfield, and Belgrave" as too familiar, he goes on to say

"I have, therefore, like a maiden knight with his white shield, assumed for my hero, WAVERLEY, an uncontaminated name, bearing with its sound little of good or evil, excepting what the reader shall hereafter be pleased to affix to it."

Though the passage as a whole is whimsically vague, Scott evidently expected his public to infer that *Waverley* was a name hitherto unknown in English fiction. Such, however, was not the case. In 1792, thirteen years before Scott began his romance, Mrs. Charlotte Smith published a novel called *Desmond*, containing a family of Waverlys [*sic*]. The father has died sometime before the opening of the story, leaving a comfortable fortune to his wife Elizabeth, two daughters named Geraldine and Frances, and a younger son known as Mr. Waverly. Geraldine, already married to a Mr. Varney, survives her disreputable husband, and falls to the lot of the hero Lionel Desmond. Frances finds her happiness in the possession of a French nobleman who has lost his title as a result of the Revolution. And Mr. Waverly plays the part of friend to the hero. The novel made considerable stir, owing to its emotional defense of the French Revolution. Burke was answered and Paine was eulogized. If Mrs. Smith lost in consequence some of her friends, she had the pleasure of seeing a quick second edition of her novel and a version in French. That Scott read the novel before beginning *Waverley*, there can be no reasonable doubt. And yet direct proof of the fact is wanting. For a collection of his prose miscellanies (1827), Scott pieced out with critical remarks a memoir of Charlotte Smith written (but not published) by her sister Mrs. Catherine Dorset. In his additions, he speaks of the deep impression that Mrs. Smith's works made on his mind at "a distant date" and analyzes several of her novels from memory, but he is curiously silent on *Desmond*. In his *Journal*, however, under the date 16 Mar. 1826, he records: "In the evening after dinner,